

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated April 7, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Claim 9 has been amended leaving Claims 1-24 for consideration upon entry of the present amendment.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-8 and 17-24 were allowed. The Examiner has stated that the reason for allowance of both Claims 1 and 17 is that the cited art (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,577 to Ramasubramani) utilizes a timestamp that reflects the time at which the certificate was issued which is different than Claims 1 and 17 which utilize a timestamp that reflects the user's sign-on time.

Claim 9 has been amended to include this element of Claims 1 and 17. Specifically, Claim 9 has been amended to recite "environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network." Applicants submit that amended Claim 9 is allowable because it includes the same element as allowable Claims 1 and 17. Because they depend from Claim 9, Applicants submit that Claims 10-16 are also allowable.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §103 (a)

Claims 9-12 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,615,347 to de Silva et al. ("de Silva") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,233,577 to Ramasubramani et al. ("Ramasubramani").

As discussed above, the Examiner has stated that Ramasubramani does not teach "environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network" as recited by amended Claim 9. Therefore, Claim 9 is patentable for at least the reason that neither de Silva nor Ramasubramani alone or in combination teach or suggest "environmental factor includes one or more system or application statuses in effect at the time the user signs-on the computer network." Because they depend from Claim 9, Applicants submit that Claims 10-12 are allowable for at least the same reasons that Claim 9 is allowable.

Claims 13-16 were rejected as being unpatentable over de Silva in view of Ramasubramani as applied to Claims 9 and 10 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552 to Grimmer ("Grimmer"). Claims 13-16 are dependent on Claim 9. Claim 9 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Because they depend from Claim 9, Applicants submit that Claims 13-16 are allowable for at least the reasons advanced above with respect to Claim 9.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 09-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD H. GUSKI ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicants' Attorney

By: 

Anne Davis Barry
Registration No. 47,408
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 46429

Date: June 6, 2005